

WORKING DRAFT

SECRET
Security Information

COPY NO. 34

E-5

PSYCHOLOGICAL STRATEGY BOARD
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

September 17, 1952

STAFF STUDY

IMPROVEMENT OF STAFF PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF
NATIONAL PSYCHOLOGICAL STRATEGY PLANS

I. PROBLEM

The present study is an analysis of specific defects which have been noted in the procedure for developing major PSB plans, together with recommendations for effecting improvements, in accordance with the instructions of the Board at the luncheon meeting of August 7, 1952.

It includes, but is not limited to, consideration of the points contained in General Balmer's memorandum to the Director of September 4, 1952, Ref: SPDM-377-52.

It is concerned only with problems of staff procedure and doctrine relevant to the development of national psychological strategy plans and does not contain any analysis or recommendations with respect to other aspects of PSB planning.

This definition of the problem is based upon the urgent need for clarification or resolution of actual problems which have arisen in the course of current planning work.

II. ANALYSIS

A. Planning Concept

As a new organization working in an unconventional and somewhat ill-defined field, PSB has been forced to develop a philosophy of planning at the same time it has developed its plans. Up to the present this philosophy has been developed on a trial-and-error basis. In discharging his responsibility to the Board for preparing its work-papers, the Director has been obliged to operate without authoritative and explicit guidance in regard to such matters as the scope and limits of

Security Information

WORKING DRAFTSECRET
Security Information

E-5 9/17/52

national psychological strategy plans, the level of planning, and the nature and extent of PSB's authority. No general requirements have been laid down by the Board as yet even in regard to matters of planning terminology and format.

One consequence of this situation is that PSB planning panels continue to spend a good deal of time arguing about the purpose, scope and level of PSB planning, the optimum length of plans and the way in which they should be arranged. These discussions were probably useful and inevitable in the early stages of PSB's growth, but they are time-consuming and it should now be possible to dispense with them.

A more serious consequence of the lack of authoritative guidance for planning is that PSB panels have tended to adopt a format and an implicit planning concept which are open to serious criticism. In addition to the criticisms made in General Balmer's memorandum of September 4, 1952, Ref. SPDM-377-52, the validity of which largely depends on the Board's understanding of its mission and authority, several more pragmatic objections could be raised to most of the PSB plans developed under the present system. They represent an awkward hybrid between strategic and tactical planning, they tend to be diffuse, incoherent and superficial, they are too long, and they are hard to read and understand.

The planning concept expressed in the memorandum from General Balmer to which reference has been made presents planners with a difficult problem but by the very fact that it forces them to discover a central strategic concept, rather than merely to list a catalogue of heterogeneous actions, it should lead to sounder plans.

B. Role of PSB Panels

The panel system under which PSB develops most of its plans is time-consuming, untidy and tends to crystallize agreement at the level of the lowest common denominator. On the other hand, it promotes

Security Information

WORKING DRAFTSECRET

E-5 9/17/52

Security Information

inter-agency cooperation, causes member agencies to take a greater interest in PSB, and represents an effort to follow the injunction in the Presidential Directive of April 4, 1951, to utilize to the maximum the resources of member agencies.

One of the reasons why the virtues of the panel system do not outweigh its inherent defects is that the latter are aggravated by unnecessary confusion as to the mission, responsibilities and authority of the group.

This confusion is most serious when the chairman of a panel is not a member of the Director's staff. Most of our panels have outside chairmen -- usually State Department representatives -- and this pattern has been encouraged by the Board, which in some cases has called for State Department panel chairmen in authorizing plans. Even when an outside chairman is appointed at the Director's own initiative, however, the Director at present has little authority over the panel, and attempts to exercise any control frequently lead to friction between the chairman and the executive secretary who is the Director's own representative on the panel.

On the other hand, in surrendering some of his own authority to the chairman, the Director does not delegate it to a member agency which can then be held responsible for the satisfactory direction of the panel. The reason for this is that a State Department chairman does not represent State on the panel. Like all other members he is informed that according to the official theory he is not required or authorized to present his agency's official position. Technically he represents nobody but himself, and in fact he may be substantially out of line with official thinking in his agency. This is especially likely to be true when a high-ranking officer of the State Department is the nominal chairman of a PSB panel while one of his junior subordinates directs it in fact.

While the panels tend to regard themselves as ^{autonomous} sovereign bodies arriving at authoritative decisions through majority vote or internal

WORKING DRAFTSECRET
Security Information

E-5 9/17/52

negotiation, in reality these decisions may be equally unacceptable to the Director and to the higher echelons in the member agencies. This could not occur if panel members were considered to be responsible spokesmen of their respective agencies.

On the other hand, any ruling which would make panel members formally responsible for representing their agencies' viewpoints would slow down still further the work of the panels, would discourage creative thinking -- which is vitally needed in the field of psychological strategy -- would accentuate the tendency to reach agreement on the basis of the lowest common denominator, and would confuse problems of fact and procedure with problems of policy.

The right solution to the present difficulties lies in the direction of more flexibility rather than in the direction of more formality in the planning process. It calls for more effective techniques of consultation, not more elaborate techniques of deliberation. In final analysis, the difficulties which have been pointed out stem more than anything else from over-formalization of the planning process.

The panel procedure is probably used in some cases where plans could be developed more expeditiously and satisfactorily either by the Director's staff or by arrangement between him and a member agency. In other cases, possibly more numerous, the panel method is justified but the panel procedure should be made simpler, more flexible and less formal.

The panel itself should be looked upon purely as a consultative body of experts whose opinions the Director is free to accept or reject. It should be used to review and improve plans, not to draft them. It should not concern itself with the vital but time-consuming task of obtaining policy-approval for plans within the participating agencies.

Under the terms of the Presidential Directive, the Director has ample authority to reform the PSB planning system along the lines which have been suggested, but a Board-approved guidance on PSB planning procedure would facilitate his task.

WORKING DRAFTSECRET
Security Information

E-5 9/17/52

C. Clearance of Plans

Under present procedure there is a good deal of confusion with regard to the clearance of plans within member agencies up to the level of the Board member. While panel members are not officially instructed to represent agency viewpoints it is usually assumed that the final panel draft of a plan incorporates all the relevant and authoritative comments of all officials within member agencies who need to be consulted, with the exception of the Board member himself.

Consequently if the plan is approved without significant change by the Director, copies are then sent by his staff to member and participating agencies in view of formal coordination for the briefing of the Board Member or representative. When all appropriate officials within agencies have been adequately consulted any revisions in the plan which may be suggested after the Director has formally approved it are minor ones which can be disposed of by a corrigendum attached to the plan before presentation to the Board.

On the other hand, when there has not been adequate consultation, major disagreements may arise over the plan within member agencies even after it has been approved by the Director. This is particularly undesirable when a paper is scheduled for Board discussion so soon after approval by the Director that there is not time for full and orderly consideration of disagreements with the result that the Board Member may receive conflicting comments on the plan from his staff.

Unnecessary and time-consuming muddles of this sort can be automatically eliminated if the Director adopts the practice of withholding formal approval of plans until all appropriate comments from member and participating agencies have been received. This, however, will entail endless delay unless responsibility for obtaining and coordinating agency comments is centralized in one office for each member agency, while the Director's staff is assigned sole responsibility for co-ordinating the several agency comments. At the same time, the formal coordination of

WORKING DRAFTSECRET
Security Information

E-5 9/17/52

agency comments on a completed plan should be considered only the final stage of a series of frequent informal consultations between the Director's staff and relevant officials in member agencies going back to the very genesis of the plan. Undue reliance on the panel method has hitherto inhibited free and constant consultation between the Director's staff and the member agencies. In regard to the clearance of plans, as well as other aspects of planning, our formal procedures should be tighter but fewer.

Another and related vice of the planning system deserves consideration. The system operates in one direction only--from the bottom upward. Those senior government officials, including the Board Members and Alternates, who are the best qualified to make sound decisions of psychological strategy, under the present system seldom have occasion to make any decisions at all until they are confronted with a completed plan developed by their subordinates. If these subordinates have disagreed on some major points but have finally decided for the sake of convenience to eliminate all controversial elements from the plan and include only the platitudes on which all can agree, the senior officials who might have constructively resolved the original controversy are left unaware of the issues.

To correct this situation it is important that the views of senior agency officials, of Board Alternates and Members, and of the Director should be ascertained in regard to major problems of psychological strategy at early stages of the planning process. This is particularly essential where there are basic and seemingly irreconcilable disagreements among working-level experts. Such disagreements can often be identified at an early stage of planning and careful staff work will reveal quite quickly whether or not they can be constructively resolved at the working level.

Where constructive resolution of disagreements cannot be achieved at the working level they should be referred to higher authority

WORKING DRAFTSECRET
Security Information

E-5 9/17/52

through some simple and flexible procedure without awaiting the formal clearance of a completed plan. It is undesirable that the Board's time should be wasted on problems which can be settled at a lower level, but it is also undesirable that PSB papers should be watered-down to the point where rubber-stamp approval is a foregone conclusion because they contain nothing sufficiently significant to disagree about.

In many cases difficult problems could be resolved without the intervention of Board Members themselves through more frequent use of the Board Alternates and the Military Adviser or through an ad hoc inter-agency meeting at the level of the Deputy-Alternates. It is inherent in the nature of PSB's work that there should sometimes be deep divergencies on problems of psychological strategy between member agencies. Instead of seeking to eliminate disagreement at any cost, the Director's staff can usually render a more constructive service by objectively analyzing disagreements that arise in the course of planning and by advising the Director and the Board on the machinery best suited for resolving them.

D. Delay in Producing PSB Plans

All existing PSB panels are working too slowly. It is estimated that in some cases it will be almost a year between the time when plans were authorized by the Board and the time when they are presented, with fully coordinated agency comments, to the Board for approval. This lead-time is excessive and discourages rather than encourages thoughtful, constructive work. On the other hand, efforts by the Director's staff to speed up the work of the panels may produce a last-minute rush which is not conducive to careful staff work. The difficulty might be reduced if the Director in consultation with the Board, would set a fixed deadline for the completion of each plan.

E. Selection of Planning Problems

In proposing or authorizing new planning projects the Board and the Director's staff, during the current year, have put emphasis on broad

WORKING DRAFTSECRET
Security Information 25X6

E-5 9/17/52

comprehensive area or country plans such as the [REDACTED] Plan, the Southeast Asia Plan and the Middle East Plan. Plans of this type are useful in guiding psychological operations in strategic areas, in encouraging responsible, balanced operational planning in the member agencies, and in fostering inter-agency cooperation. They are also essential in laying a basis for PSB Coordination and Evaluation activities.

On the other hand, plans of this type over-extend the resources available to PSB since it is difficult to assemble the wide range of expert skills and background required for such comprehensive plans. They therefore tend to be rather superficial and banal and fail to encourage the concentration of resources on vital targets. From a doctrinal viewpoint they are of little assistance in deepening and clarifying the concept of psychological strategy since they inevitably involve a good deal of overlapping with conventional political and economic strategy.

To encourage maximum development of the new unconventional field of psychological strategy, as intended by the Presidential Directive of April 4, 1951, it is desirable that PSB in the future should give increasing emphasis to a more concentrated and specialized type of planning based on intensive study of specific psychological and sociological problems, whether global or peculiar to a geographical area. While all plans must be developed within the framework of established policy, it is important that the courses of action recommended should stem not from a routine listing of NSC policy objectives but from an expert analysis of the factors peculiar to psychological strategy. These plans should deliberately aim at demonstrating the possibilities of psychological strategy in view of possible wider applications and should involve a determined effort to discover new approaches.

Security Information
SECRET

Page 8 of 14

WORKING DRAFTSECRET
Security Information

E-5 9/17/52

III. CONCLUSIONS

A. PSB planning concepts and doctrine should be clarified in a paper having the authority of the Board behind it, and a standard Board-approved planning format should be adopted for national psychological strategy plans, subject to the discretion of the Director to modify it in exceptional cases. The standard planning format should be as brief and simple as possible and should be based upon the principles laid down in the Military Adviser's memorandum to the Director of September 4, 1952, Ref. SPDM-377-52. The proposed outline for a standard format presented in Annex A conforms to the requirements which have been listed and embodies the instructions needed to clarify PSB planning concepts.

B. The difficulties analyzed in Paragraphs B, C, and D of SECTION II do not stem from a single cause but all could be corrected by a Board-approved document establishing or confirming planning procedures, clarifying the functions and responsibilities of the Director's staff, and laying down authoritative guidance as a basis for briefing the Director's staff and the personnel of member agencies concerned with PSB affairs. A proposed guidance on planning procedure is presented in Annex B.

C. The re-orientation of PSB planning suggested in II, E, can be effected by the Director with the authorization of the Board.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. That the Board approve the planning concept developed in Annex A and authorize the Director to develop all plans in accordance with the standard format set forth therein, or to modify it to fit special cases as he considers advisable. ✓

B. That the Board approve Annex B, instruct the Director to use it as a basis for briefing his staff, and request member agencies to similarly utilize it as a basis for briefing personnel concerned with PSB matters. ✓

Security Information
SECRET

Page 13 of 14

WORKING DRAFT

SECRET
Security Information

E-5 9/17/52

C. That the Board instruct the Director, without completely abandoning country and area planning of the type now under way, to give increased emphasis in future planning to more specialized problems with significant psychological implications. ✓

Security Information
SECRET

Page 14 of 14

ANNEX AWORKING DRAFTSECRET
Security Information

E-5 9/17/52

#34

PROPOSED STANDARD PSB PLANNING FORMATTITLE

"A National Psychological Strategy with Respect to _____."

(Since the section usually headed "The Problem" in existing plans serves only a formalistic purpose, it is omitted from this proposed format).

SECTION I. PSYCHOLOGICAL OBJECTIVES

Psychological Objectives to be listed in this section are derived from the Analysis in Annex A, which will be attached to all plans for the Board to note. Since applicable national policy papers will be examined in the Annex, all references to them are omitted in this section.

Objectives will be listed in succinct tabular form, in order of priority when they can be clearly and accurately stated in this fashion, but where proper understanding of the plan's intent makes this desirable, the tabular form may be replaced by a series of numbered paragraphs providing sufficient interpretation to clarify the intent.

The term Psychological Objectives as here used does not refer exclusively to desired attitudes in the target group, but to results of major importance in terms of established national policy which appear achievable in the target area through operations conducted in accordance with NSC 59/1 and 10/2 and 10/5, together ^{with} necessary supporting actions in other fields. The factors which must be analyzed and balanced to determine these objectives are specified in the Annex.

Since the Psychological Objectives must be in conformity with established national policy, Section I will be considered as constituting the terms of reference to the paper and will be subject to approval under existing procedures.

Security Information
SECRETPage 9 of 34
1 - 4

WORKING DRAFT

SECRET
Security Information

E-5 9/17/52

SECTION II. PROPOSED PSYCHOLOGICAL STRATEGY

The basis of this section will be a brief statement of the principles which should guide the framing of implementation-plans with particular respect to:

- a) The development of coherent 59/1 and 10/2 programs, with indication of priority tasks.
- b) The coordination of these programs with each other and with other national programs, and their integration into effective psychological campaigns.
- c) The scope, pace and timing of the programs and the sequence or phasing of the campaigns.

As further guidance to operational planners, the section may include where appropriate one or more of the following:

1. Special DO'S and DON'TS from the viewpoint of conformity with established policy.
 2. Similar broad guidance on major points of operational doctrine appropriate to the area and situation.
 - ✓ 3. Strategic Tasks and Actions. A brief, highly selective list of actions of such outstanding importance that failure to implement them would vitiate the strategy.
- 2 Such actions, however, may only be listed with the authoritative concurrence of the agencies or departments responsible for implementing them.

Where appropriate, certain elements in Paragraph 3 or other parts of Section II may be submitted by the Director to the Board separately in a covert supplement.

SECTION III. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

This section will contain special administrative provisions not covered by the SOP for the coordination phase and requiring Board approval, together with provisions for logistic support, where relevant.

Security Information

SECRET

Page 20 of 14

WORKING DRAFT

SECRET
Security Information

E-5 9/17/52

ANNEX A. Analysis

This annex has two functions:

1. The first is to justify selection of the Psychological Objectives in Section I. This section of the analysis will be as brief as possible but will always include the following elements:

- a) Analysis of applicable approved national policy objectives, with indications as to priorities of urgency and importance.
- b) Estimate of US psychological capabilities with respect to achievement of national objectives.
- c) Analysis of feasibility-factors in the target area which decisively limit or facilitate maximum exploitation of capabilities in the desired direction.
- d) Conclusions as to maximum feasible effects desired through 59/1, 10/2 and related psychological supporting actions. These conclusions to be valid must always constitute recognizable steps towards the attainment of some or all of the national objectives set forth in (a) above, but will usually be more specific and limited. These conclusions, condensed and stated as imperatives become the Psychological Objectives.

2. The second function of the annex is to clarify, qualify and explain the strategic concept which constitutes the core of Section II.

The substance and form of this section will vary somewhat according to the situation studied but the most essential element will always be an analysis or evaluation of the present U.S. psychological effort in the area in terms of the Psychological Objectives of Section I.

By indicating where existing programs are failing or succeeding, and to what degree, this analysis should indicate clearly the re-orientation and/or expansion which is required to attain the objectives and this provides the basis of the strategic concept.

Security Information

WORKING DRAFTSECRET
Security Information

E-5 9/17/52

In most cases the analysis should also include a brief statement of the strategic situation within the target area and between the area and other areas or powers having important interests there, with particular attention to the aims, scope, form and effectiveness of communist psychological operations in the area.

While this section of the Annex should also be as brief as possible, it will generally need to be more detailed than the former one, and the tabular form of analysis will not be suitable.

Agreement by the Board to note the contents of Annex A will be understood as giving it the value of authoritative guidance in determining whether or not implementation plans conform to the intent of Sections I and II.

ANNEX B. Illustrative Actions

The purpose of this Annex is to provide a rough measuring-rod to assist in determining the feasibility and adequacy of implementation plans prepared in accordance with the approved national psychological strategy. It will list feasible, effective programs and actions which member agencies might undertake in implementation of the plan with suggestions for primary and supporting roles in each case. The implementing actions listed will not be considered as complete or definitive and neither the actions themselves nor the suggested assignments of agency responsibility will be considered as binding upon any participating agency.

Board agreement to note the contents of Annex B will be understood as a certification that the actions and programs listed, while not essential to the implementation of the strategy, are in conformity with it and are presumed to be effective and feasible.

In order that Annex B be of maximum usefulness to operational planners and to the Director's staff in the implementation and coordination phase of the planning, it is desirable that one illustrative high-priority program or action be listed for each major directive of Section II. In some cases, additional illustrations may be provided but no effort should be made to anticipate the complete implementation plans of each participating agency.

Where appropriate, parts of Annex B may be submitted by the Director separately as a covert supplement.

Security Information
SECRET

Page 12 of 14

SECRETSecurity InformationANNEX BWORKING DRAFT

E-5

9/17/52

DOCTRINE AND PROCEDURE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PSB PLANSA. Scope and Form of PSB Plans.

1. PSB National Psychological Strategy plans establish the strategy of those psychological operations included in NSC 10/2 and NSC 59/1 in support of approved national policies. They shall also include where appropriate actions or courses of action in other fields, when such actions or courses of action are related to the execution of 10/2 and 59/1 programs and essential to their achieving maximum impact, and providing they have the authoritative concurrence of the agencies or departments responsible for implementing them.

2. PSB National Psychological Strategy plans, when approved by the Board, constitute authoritative guidance to U. S. government agencies for the development of operational plans in accordance with the approved strategy.

3. National psychological strategy plans shall be prepared in the form and terminology prescribed in ANNEX A, but the Director is authorized to modify the standard form to fit special cases at his discretion.

B. Role of the Director and His Staff in Developing PSB Plans.

1. Under the Presidential Directive of April 4, 1951, the Director is responsible for having prepared the programs, policies, reports and recommendations for the Board's consideration, and for promulgating its decisions. In accordance with accepted administrative practice, this responsibility entails the obligation in preparing work-papers for the Board to incorporate in them the views of all agencies concerned with, or affected by, these papers or, where disagreement exists, to accompany work-papers prepared in accordance with the Director's views with a full objective and authoritative statement of any dissenting agency views.

2. In discharging his responsibility to the Board for the preparation of its work papers, the Director is authorized to use his own staff as

SECRET
Security Information

ANNEX B
E-5
9/17/52

WORKING DRAFT

he considers advisable but, in accordance with the Presidential Directive, shall attempt to the maximum extent to utilize the facilities and resources of the participating departments and agencies. In developing plans he may at his discretion employ his own staff, request a member agency to prepare a draft plan, establish an inter-agency panel, or combine all three of these methods in various proportions.

3. Planning panels shall report to the Director through the staff channel designated by him, normally the Assistant Director for the Office of Plans and Policy of his staff. The panels may be convoked, suspended or dissolved at the Director's discretion. Panel members are appointed by the Director with the approval of the agencies or departments to which they belong, and he also selects the chairman and executive secretary and determines their functions.

C. Initiation of Plans.

1. The Director shall undertake the development or revision of national psychological strategy plans only when so directed by the Board, but may on his own initiative, at any time, submit for the Board's determination a proposal for the development or revision of a national psychological strategy plan.

2. While less formal procedures may be utilized at the Director's discretion, it is usually desirable that proposals for a new national psychological strategy plan should be supported by a short staff study analyzing the problems to be solved and indicating the need for a psychological strategy to deal with them. Whenever feasible this study should include terms of reference for the planners--i.e. the proposed Objectives of the Plan. When this is not feasible, the Director shall submit the terms of reference for approval by the Board, or Alternates, at the earliest practical moment.

3. In considering new planning proposals for submission to the Board, the Director shall instruct his staff to consult informally with appropriate

SECRET
Security Information

ANNEX B
E-5
9/17/52

WORKING DRAFT

representatives of member agencies, particularly in regard to the selection and definition of the problem. After Board approval of the planning project, similar informal consultations should be held between the Director's staff and member agencies with regard to the best method of attacking the problem, the research and other support likely to be required, the advisability of establishing a panel, and the selection of qualified members and of a chairman for the panel.

D. Development of Plans.

1. As soon as possible after the approval of a planning project by the Board, the Director shall state to participating agencies what support or assistance he desires from them in developing the plan. At the same time, he shall notify them of the deadline he has set for completion of the plan.

2. In deciding whether or not to use the panel method for developing the plan, the Director shall take into account such factors as the availability of qualified personnel on his own staff and among participating agencies, the seriousness and extent of disagreements in regard to the problem among participating agencies, and the extent to which knotty issues involving the application of national policy are likely to be encountered. Similar considerations should determine the choice of the chairman.

3. Before convening a panel the Director shall instruct his staff to hold informal consultations with designated panel members in regard to the scope and methodology of the project and, whenever feasible, to develop the main body of the plan in draft or outline form as a basis for the panel's work.

4. Unless a representative of a participating agency is appointed chairman by the Director, the Executive Secretary, who is a member of the Director's staff, shall act as chairman of the panel. When an outside chairman is appointed he shall direct the work of the panel, in accordance

Security Information

SECRET
Security Information

ANNEX B
E-5
9/17/52

WORKING DRAFT

with the Director's instructions and with the assistance of the Executive Secretary.

5. Views expressed by panel members shall not be considered as authoritatively reflecting the views of their agencies or departments, but panel members are expected to consult frequently with responsible policy-maker officers in their respective agencies or departments so that they may more usefully advise the chairman and the Director's staff on problems involving inter-agency cooperation.

6. Unless otherwise instructed by the Director, the panel chairman shall seek to economize the time of members by holding formal meetings to a minimum and replacing them whenever feasible by informal consultations. As far as possible, he shall use the panel to review and revise drafts prepared by himself, by the Director's staff, or by a designated member. When the panel chairman is a representative of a participating agency he shall consult with the Executive Secretary or other members of the Director's staff before undertaking or issuing any drafting assignments.

7. When a complete draft of the plan, satisfactory to the panel and to the Director, has been developed, responsibility for obtaining the required agency comments and effecting revisions that may be necessary shall lie with the Executive Secretary, or other designated member of the Director's staff, but the chairman and panel members should be prepared on request to facilitate clearance of the draft in their respective agencies or departments, or to assist in revising it.

E. Clearance of Plans.

1. Plans submitted to the Board for formal approval shall be acceptable as to content and wording to all appropriate officials in participating agencies or departments up to the level of the Board Member (or the equivalent official in a non-member agency), or when disagreements

SECRET
Security Information

Page 4 of 6

SECRETSecurity Information

ANNEX B

E-5

9/17/52

WORKING DRAFT

exist they shall be objectively analyzed with clear alternate texts, and presented to the Board for resolution. To facilitate compliance with this rule it is recommended that:

a) The Director withhold formal approval of the Plan until he is informed by his staff that all appropriate clearances have been effected within participating agencies;

b) Regardless of whether plans are developed by panels or through some other method, the first complete draft which is satisfactory to the Director and the planners be circulated to participating agencies for comment, and that subsequent drafts as appropriate be cleared in the same manner;

c) Each member or regularly participating agency designate one official who shall be responsible for supervising the clearance of PSB draft plans within the agency and for coordinating the comments collected;

d) Such formal procedures be complemented by frequent and close consultations between PSB staff planners--assisted by the panel members when appropriate--and officials of participating agencies, so that the plan is steadily improved as its clearance progresses.

2. At any stage of the planning process when basic disagreements develop among participating agencies, or between them and the Director's staff, which in the Director's view require and justify resolution at a higher level, he shall take the steps which in his judgment are best suited to achieve resolution of the disagreement. Depending upon the circumstances, he may:

a) Instruct a senior official of his staff to consult with equivalent officials of participating agencies;

b) Utilize the liaison officers of the participating agencies;

Security InformationSECRET

Page 5 of 6

SECRET

ANNEX B

Security Information

E-5

9/17/52

WORKING DRAFT

c) Call an ad hoc meeting of the Board Alternates or of designated deputies;

d) Consult informally himself with Board Members or Alternates;

e) Formally submit the issue for resolution at a regular, special or luncheon meeting of the Board.

3. Upon approval by the Board, the Director shall promulgate the approved national psychological strategy in accordance with existing procedures.

F. Implementation of Plans.

In the implemental phase of planning the Director is responsible for ascertaining and reporting to the Board that implementation plans in support of the approved national psychological strategy are being prepared by the participating agencies or departments, that these implementation plans are in conformity with the approved strategy, and that they are properly coordinated among the participating departments or agencies. To this end he may call upon the participating agencies or departments to submit to him their implementation plans or to report otherwise to him on implemental action taken or under consideration in regard to the approved psychological strategy, and he is empowered to establish special panels to advise him on problems of coordination related to the implementation of approved plans. Upon approval of the psychological strategy, or as soon thereafter as possible, the Director shall notify participating agencies of his requirements in respect to the implemental phase of planning.

25X1A

P [REDACTED] es

Security InformationSECRET